☞ 07hr_CRule_07-114_SC-TT_pt01

Details:

(FORM UPDATED: 07/12/2010)

WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE ... PUBLIC HEARING - COMMITTEE RECORDS

2007-08

(session year)

Senate

(Assembly, Senate or Joint)

Committee on ... Transportation and Tourism (SC-TT)

COMMITTEE NOTICES ...

- Committee Reports ... CR
- Executive Sessions ... ES
- Public Hearings ... PH
- Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

INFORMATION COLLECTED BY COMMITTEE FOR AND AGAINST PROPOSAL

- Appointments ... Appt
- Clearinghouse Rules ... CRule
- Hearing Records ... bills and resolutions

(ab = Assembly Bill) (sb = Senate Bill)

(ar = Assembly Resolution)

(**sr** = Senate Resolution)

(ajr = Assembly Joint Resolution) (sjr = Senate Joint Resolution)

Miscellaneous ... Misc

2/24/07

Assembly Trans hearing

John John

- ALLOWING THE DEPT TO CONSIDER NEW WAYS OF DELIVERYNG SERVICES USIDE FROM CURRENT WAY
 - HOW THE TESTS WILL BE DONE

 CAN DO SELF-TESTING.
 - ALLOWS THE DEPT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF WHAT THE MARKET CAN OFFER.
- OANNUT ALSO REPAIR.
- ANSWER: THE QUESTION HAS MORE TO DO WITH MITE REP AND NOT THE RULE.
- THE RFP GOES INTO DETAIL WHO IS ELIGIBLE AND OVERSIGHT
- MA PETRONISKI 25,000 OBD IS THAT
 - WHY NOT HAVE CENTERS DO ALL TESTS -
 - DOT: THERE'S A SIGNIFICANT COST DIFFERENCE IN COST FOR OBDIT REMOTE TESTING AND SETTING UP A COMPRENSIVE TESTING CENTER

	スプチージ
W OMITE MEMBERS CONCERNED ABOUT	-
SAME AWINTORISED INSPECTION FAOILLIES	JIPICATION I
ARCE MLSO REPOMIR SHOPS	III :
- DOT: NOT SPECIFIED IN RULE.	1
- DOT: MERE WILL BE COVERT ANDIS AT TEXTING	
FACILITIES	
RON KNEHN - ENVIROTEST	
- WHAT HAPPENS IF TITE COMPINED IS	
WONKY THAT DAY? (IT GIES REDECTED)	
THEN THE CUSTOMER HAS TO GO TO	
ALUTO IZEPATIC SITOP, COME BACK ALLA	
GET RE-TESTED. THE RULE DOESN'T CALL	
FOR A BACK HP TEST - WITHOUT NEGRATES	
ENVIRONITEST RFP BECAUSES TITELY	
WANT TO OFFER A BACKUP TEST.	
WANTS TO ATTO BACK WE TEST REQUIREMENTS	
RESOLVE ISSUE OF TESTER BEILLY A	
REPAIR SHOP (OR SUBCONITRACTOR)	
WOTEINBRINK - MHOW DOES DIESEL AFFECT	
ENVIROTEST - KON: NOT SURE.	

RON KNEHN -

ASM COMMITTEE DECIDED NOT TO OBJECT.
FRUSTRATED. APPARENTLY DOT STID THAT
131 DOESN'T CONFLICT WY 504 AND THAT IF
IT DOES THEY WILL CHANGE IT

JOAN CLEAVER >

JOAN CLEAVER >

JS SENTINEL REPORTER

PER BRAD BOYCKS SHE'S LOOKING FOR INFORMATION ON SB28

TOM WALKER C: 209-1000 4/9/08 > SENT EMAIL TO TOM & PAT, ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THEY'RE IN D.C.

LANGRY KONDPARKY 6-0683
He doesn'te know that it's his place
but Jerry gave every indication
that his spent plenty of firm on
this now.

RON KUEHN IN PETROWSKI, GOTTLIEB, SHERMAN, STEINBRINK SIT DOWN W/ DOT AND WORK OUT SOME OHANGES. IF CHANGES ARENT MADE TO REP THEN THERE WILL BE A LAWSIUT BY THE LOSING BIDDER. IT WOULD BE EASIER TO FIX RFP MON INSTEAD OF GOING THROUGH A LAWSHITE

3/28/08 > Jason (Petrowski) Cottlieb/Jerry/Steinbrink/Sherman and Larry Koropacki the tailpipe emissions test should be optional if they have them already they should be abu to use them. If the computer doesn't work, go get it fixed and come back for a votest



WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE





WTBA Testimony

Revisions to Trans 131

Tom Walker, Director of Government Affairs

February 4, 2008

WTBA would like the Department to reconsider its process as follows:

- Submit the study of future options as soon as possible to the Legislature, required by May 1, 2008, to allow for Legislative hearings.
- Extend the existing contract until the rule is approved, preferably after the study and other information is considered by the Legislature
- Include any program charges in the Department's 2009 Biennial Budget recommendations.

In our view, the rule should define what DOT will do directly or through its own contractors, rather than leaving the language vague. Even if choice is maintained in the rule, more detail on the potential choices seems appropriate.

Finally, we found the rule language confusing in many locations with respect to the role of the vendor in sub-contracting self-service testing vs. the Department's intent to issue independent contracts for this purpose.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

WTBA sincerely appreciates the opportunity to provide testimony on the Department's proposed revisions to Trans 131.

WTBA is a statewide organization of more than 260 contractors, consultants, and associated businesses. Our members design, build, rehabilitate, improve, reconstruct, expand and modernize every form of transportation infrastructure, including state and local roads and bridges, airports, railroads, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Most of our contracting members are multi-generational Wisconsin companies that employ numerous workers and pay family supporting wages and benefits.

WTBA has always strongly supported the I/M Program and continues to do so.

We believe that the clear intent of the I/M provisions in 2007 ACT 20 is to provide more alternatives to centralized testing, in order to reduce program costs while ensuring the integrity and effectiveness of the I/M program.

Our understanding of the rule leads us to conclude that the proposed changes fail to meet that intent.

To the best of our knowledge, no bid proposal has ever come in lower than the proposal by the existing vendor, creating a de facto monopoly. The reason is simple: the contractor owns the centralized facilities; no vendor can add the capital costs of new facilities and possibly underbid the company with the current contract. Without real competition, there is no incentive to save costs.

The legislature clearly envisioned DOT setting up self-service testing as an equivalent alternative to those set up by the vendor. ACT 20 also requires DOT to consider remote testing, and testing by certified motor vehicle dealers (which is the case in some states).

The termination of dynamometer testing, and its replacement with OBD testing will result in the need for less expensive equipment, smaller space requirements, and logically, lower program costs.

We believe that the option of using <u>certified</u> motor vehicle dealers will ultimately provide neighborhood testing at a lower program cost, without compromising the program's integrity.

However, this rule envisions yet another long-term contract with a vendor, who <u>may</u> set up self-service testing. There is no provision for DOT setting up its own testing sites, nor opportunities for motor vehicle dealers to set up testing, except for some vague permissive language.

We understand that the Department has or is in the process of issuing an RFP for a new 5-year contract. This makes any major cost-savings program changes virtually impossible until 2013.



WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE





From:

Walsh, Patrick

Sent:

Monday, February 25, 2008 10:33 AM

To:

Piliouras, Elizabeth

Subject:

RE: Emissions testing provision in the budget

Attachments:

motion280.pdf

Beth.

Attached is Stone and Voss's motion. The May 1 date was not changed.

Jon Dyck said under the current system DOT sends out a request for proposal and awards the contract to the lowest bidder. He indicated that the company who currently has the contract has a big advantage because they already have all the equipment and facilities in place to do the testing. Thus, they always win the contract because they don't have to factor in those costs while new bidders have to factor in the costs of purchasing the equipment and facilities.

If you have any questions let me know.

Pat



motion280.pdf (35 KB)

From:

Piliouras, Elizabeth

Sent:

Sunday, February 24, 2008 7:29 PM

To:

Walsh, Patrick

Subject:

Emissions testing provision in the budget

Hi Patrick:

I need your help with this one... CR07-114 as a result of the emissions testing provision in the budget has been referred to Roger's committee. It was proposed by the Gov, changed by the JFC and then reappeared in the conference committee budget version.

The issue is whether or not the Legislature intended that the DOT look at a single contractor for testing or also intended the DOT to look at remote, self-service locations. The WTBA sent in comments that the current rule, which only looks at one contractor and doesn't allow bidding (as I understand it), is contrary to the intent of the Legislature.

Do you have any thoughts/comments on this?

Thanks, Beth





TRANSPORTATION -- MOTOR VEHICLES

Vehicle Emissions Testing Program Study

[LFB Paper #797]

Motion:

Move to require DOT to conduct a study of alternative program models for the vehicle emissions inspection program, including testing done by certified motor vehicle dealers, with emissions test results transmitted electronically to DOT, and remote emissions testing. Require the Department to provide a report summarizing the results of the study to the standing committees of each house of the Legislature dealing with transportation issues, by May 1, 2008.

Note:

Vehicle emissions testing is currently conducted at public testing stations operating by a private firm under contract with the Department of Transportation. The cost of the contract is paid from a transportation fund appropriation, funded at \$13,274,400 in 2006-07. There is no cost to vehicle owners for the test. This motion would require the Department of Transportation to conduct a study of an alternative testing methods and provide a report summarizing the results of the study to the transportation committees of each house of the Legislature by May 1, 2008.



WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE



MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSION INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM Wis. Stat. § 110.20

Concerns Regarding Maintenance of the Anti-fraud Provisions of the Statute as Adopted by the Legislature—Proposed TRANS 131 (Revised)

See Emalacehir
July Mandrice

July M I understand that the Wisconsin DOT has recently issued a Request for Proposal designed to evaluate the potential for new technology to achieve Wisconsin's emission inspection and maintenance program objectives, at a lower price. This is a very praiseworthy project and I commend the DOT for pursuing it.

However, in pursuit of this objective, I want to be sure that the Department is aware of the degree to which I am concerned that this program be operated in a manner that not only assures a high level of air quality improvement within the nonattainment zone, but also provides that the citizens of the state of Wisconsin affected by this program (the owners of automobiles subject to inspection) of the greatest possible assurance that they are being treated fairly.

One of the key components of the current maintenance and inspection program statute relates to protecting against fraud in the repair of automobiles identified as lacking appropriate emission protections. This "anti-fraud" section of the statute appears in § 110.20(8)(am)1. Part of that statute provides as follows:

"No officer, director or employee of the contractor may be an employee of the department or a person engaged in the business of selling, maintaining or repairing motor vehicles or selling motor vehicle replacement repair parts." ["Contractor" refers to the emissions testing vendor.]

The RFP Appears to Violate the Intent of § 110.20(8)(am), Wis. Stats. 1.

Although the statute (above) prohibits the vehicle inspector from also doing repairs, the RFP just issued actually requests proposals that ignore the clear intent of this statute.

Section 5.4.10.1 at page 57 of 136 pages of the RFP states in part, as follows, regarding the private inspection facilities (PIFs) that can engage in both inspection and repair of

"PIFs may, but need not, be a set of franchises or otherwise related business enterprises. However, they must be businesses engaged in vehicle repair work and have enclosed facilities for conducting this work. In either case, the owner(s) of these facilities would serve as subcontractor(s) to the contractor. (Emphasis supplied)

"Use of a PIF in lieu of a centralized test station for testing would be entirely at the motorist's discretion. Likewise, use of a PIF for both testing and emission-related repair, when needed, would be entirely at the motorist's discretion."

It is my belief that these sections are inconsistent with anti-fraud protections of the previously cited statute.

I appreciate that the DOT has suggested that bidding contractors do not have to propose this kind of program, but almost assuredly some will. The result almost inevitably will be the potential for the Wisconsin DOT to be faced with a dilemma: a lower priced approach to auto emission testing, at the risk of greatly expanded potential for consumer fraud (i.e., "We have tested your automobile and it failed its emissions test, and here is what we would like to do to repair the problem while you are here.") Despite the fact that this is optional to the motorist, it is, nonetheless, inconsistent with the intent of the statute which is to prohibit placing in the hands of the emissions inspector the opportunity to engage in repair of the automobile that presumably failed the test.

The RFP actually <u>anticipates</u> that combining testing with repair, by the same vendor, will result in greater fraud potential, Section 5.5.10.8.1 states:

"Neither the Contractor nor its subcontractors shall subject motorists to undue or excessive solicitation for other non-emissions related goods or services at inspection facilities. For example, neither Contractor nor subcontractor employees shall solicit motorists to purchase goods or services as a condition on inspection or receiving a compliance certificate or waiver."

Wisconsin does not need to expose our citizens to a new risk of being defrauded. We have had a statute, for over 20 years that <u>requires</u> that vehicle inspection <u>not</u> be provided by repair facilities. This RFP, in my opinion, violates that statute and that principle.

2. TRANS 131 Needs to be Amended

TRANS 131 can be amended to resolve the Legislature's anti-fraud concerns.

Current TRANS 131 does not attempt to define who a "employee" is of a contractor, nor does it define a "contractor." There is a reason for that. Under the program as it has been operated for more than two decades, this hasn't been necessary. We have what is called a "centralized" program which relies upon a contractor entirely dedicated to automobile testing and not at all engaged in the business of automobile repair.

I would strongly urge the DOT to amend TRANS 131 to provide a definition of "contractor" that includes "subcontractors" of a contractor and to affirmatively state that the prohibitions of § 110.20(8)(am)1., Wis. Stats., applies equally to both. That, I believe, is the legislative intent.

available to persons throughout this state. The rules shall include provisions regarding all of the following:

- (1) The selection of persons to install, service and remove ignition interlock devices from motor vehicles.
- (2) The periodic review of the fees charged to the owner of a vehicle for the installation, service and removal of an ignition interlock device.
- (3) Requiring ignition interlock device providers operating in this state to establish pilot programs involving the voluntary use of ignition interlock devices.
- (4) Requiring ignition interlock device providers operating in this state to provide the department and law enforcement agencies designated by the department with installation, service, tampering and failure reports in a timely manner.
- (5) Requiring ignition interlock device providers to notify the department of any ignition interlock device tampering, circumvention, bypass or violation resets, including all relevant data recorded in the device's memory. Upon receiving notice described in this subsection, the department shall immediately provide the notice and data to the assessment agency that is administering the violator's driver safety plan.

History: 1999 a. 109, 186.

Cross Reference: See also ch. Trans 313, Wis. adm. code.

- 110.20 Motor vehicle emission hispection and maintenance program. (1) Dernations in this section, unless the context requires otherwise:
- (ac) "Air pollution control equipment" has the meaning given in s. 285.30 (6) (a) 1.
- (am) "Federal act" means the federal clean air act, 42 USC 7401 et seq., and regulations issued by the federal environmental protection agency under that act.
- (b) "Nonexempt vehicle" means any motor vehicle as defined under s. 340.01 (35) which is owned by the United States or which is required to be registered in this state and to which one or more emission limitations adopted under s. 285.30 (2) applies.
- (c) "Nontransient emissions inspection" means an emissions inspection conducted on a vehicle without the use of a chassis dynamometer to vary vehicle engine loads.
- (2) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED. The department shall establish an inspection and maintenance program as provided in this section.
- (3) PURPOSE. (a) The inspection and maintenance program shall be designed to determine compliance with the emission limitations promulgated under s. 285.30 (2) and compliance with s. 285.30 (6).
- (c) The inspection and maintenance program may be designed to provide information on the fuel efficiency of nonexempt vehicles.
- (d) The inspection and maintenance program shall be designed and operated to comply with the requirements of the federal act.
- (4) DEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION. The department shall consult and cooperate with the department of natural resources in order to efficiently and fairly establish and administer the program established under this section.
- (5) Counties. The department shall operate the inspection and maintenance program in each of the following counties:
- (a) Any county identified in a certification under s. 285.30 (3). The department shall terminate the program in the county at the end of the contractual period in effect when the county is withdrawn under s. 285.30 (4).
- (b) Any county whose board of supervisors has adopted a resolution requesting the department to establish an inspection and maintenance program in the county for the purpose of improving ambient air quality beyond the standards mandated by section 7409 of the federal act. The department shall terminate the program in the county at the end of the contractual period in effect when the county board adopts a resolution requesting termination of the program.

- (6) MANDATORY INSPECTION. (a) The program shall require an emissions inspection under sub. (11) of any nonexempt vehicle customarily kept in a county identified in sub. (5) as follows:
- 1. For a nonexempt vehicle required to be registered on an annual or other periodic basis in this state, within the period of time specified by the department under sub. (9) (d) prior to renewal of registration in the 4th year after the nonexempt vehicle's model year and every 2 years thereafter, except as provided in sub. (9) (j).
- 2. For a nonexempt vehicle required to be registered on an annual or other periodic basis in this state, within the period of time specified by the department under sub. (9) (d) of registration other than renewal if the year of registration is at least 6 years after the nonexempt vehicle's model year.
- 3. For a nonexempt vehicle that is registered under s. 341.26 (2m), owned by the United States or subject to one-time registration, at any time during the 4th year following the nonexempt vehicle's model year and every 2 years thereafter.
- 4. For a nonexempt vehicle, whenever the owner of the vehicle is notified under sub. (9) (g) that an emissions inspection must be performed.
- (b) The program shall require an air pollution control equipment inspection to determine compliance with s. 285.30 (6) of any nonexempt vehicle customarily kept in a county identified in sub. (5) whenever a nontransient emissions inspection is performed or at the time of application for a waiver under sub. (13).
- (6m) PROHIBITED INSPECTIONS. The department may not require an emissions inspection of any vehicle prior to the inspection of the vehicle scheduled under sub. (6) (a) 1. or (9) (d) or (j) if an interest in the vehicle is transferred to a surviving spouse under s. 342.17 (4).
- (7) VOLUNTARY INSPECTIONS. The inspection and maintenance program shall require inspection of any nonexempt vehicle which a person presents for inspection at an inspection station or at any other location where, as established under sub. (8) (bm), the vehicle may be inspected.
- NOTE: Sub. (7) is shown as amended eff. 7-1-08 by 2007 Wis. Act 20. Prior to 7-1-08 it reads:
- (7) VOLUNTARY INSPECTIONS. The inspection and maintenance program shall require inspection of any nonexempt vehicle which a person presents for inspection at an inspection station.
- (8) Contractors and other inspection methods. (am) 1. The emissions test and equipment inspection of nonexempt vehicles may be performed by persons under contract with the department. Each such contract shall require the contractor to operate inspection stations for a minimum of 3 years and shall provide for equitable compensation to the contractor if the operation of an inspection and maintenance program within any county is terminated within 3 years after the inspection and maintenance program in the country is begun. No officer the contractor may be an employed of the contractor may be an employed of the contractor may be an employed of the accountry to the contractor may be an employed of the accountry of the accountry of the contractor may be an explored on the contractor of th ficient number of inspection stations, permanent or mobile, to ensure public convenience in those counties identified under sub.
- 1m. Each contract under subd. 1. may authorize or require the contractor to install and operate self-service inspection stations and may allow the use of different methods for emissions testing and equipment inspection, consistent with methods established under par. (bm), than those used at inspection stations that are not self-service.
- 2. The department may require the contractor to test the fuel efficiency of nonexempt vehicles during emission inspections.
- 3. The department may delegate to the contractor specified registration functions of the department under ch. 341. The department may direct the contractor to perform specified registration functions under ch. 341.

Text from the 2005-06 Wis. Stats. database updated by the Revisor of Statutes. Only printed statutes are certified under s. 35.18 (2), stats. Statutory changes effective prior to 1-2-08 are printed as if currently in effect. Statutory changes effective on or after 1-2-08 are designated by NOTES. Report errors at (608) 266-2011, FAX 264-6978, http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/



services as a condition of inspection or receiving a compliance certificate or waiver. The Contractor shall assist the Department in determining whether such conduct has occurred at its facilities or its subcontractors' facilities.

Proposers should describe measures they will take to address this issue.

5.4.10.8.2 Notifications

The Contractor and its subcontractors shall notify motorists at inspection facilities (using one or more conspicuous signs) the following: (1) damage claims procedure information, (2) the fact that no fee is required to receive an emissions inspection; and, (3) that the motorist is under no obligation to purchase any goods or services from the emissions inspection provider.

5.4.11 Testing Kiosk Requirements

5.4.11.1 General

While the Department is interested in deploying fully self-service test kiosks at a future date, it believes that the initial availability of assistance from professional inspection facility staff will be critical to motorist acceptance of kiosk testing. Consequently:

- Kiosks deployed during the Contractor's first two years of full program operation must be sited at an existing CIF, and
- The Contractor must ensure that professional assistance is available at all kiosks at all times during which the associated CIF operates.

Effective July 1, 2012, WisDOT may elect to discontinue the professional assistance requirement at some or all of the kiosks deployed at the contract start date, or may elect to require continued staffing at all of them. The Contractor will be responsible for ensuring that professional assistance remains available at any kiosks identified by the Department.

Additionally, at WisDOT's request the Contractor shall ensure that assistance is available at any newly deployed kiosks, at all times during which the associated test site operates, for a minimum of two years from deployment.

5.4.11.2 Required Kiosk Features

All test kiosks shall be identical in appearance, and shall display on their cabinets Department-approved program logos and colors. The kiosk appearance shall be shown to and approved by the Department prior to production and deployment.

Each kiosk deployed on behalf of the WVIP shall feature:

- Equipment requirements specified in Section 5.5.2.4;
- User interface requirements specified in Section 5.5.2.6.2;

PROPOSED ORDER OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ADOPTING RULES

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation proposes an order to repeal TRANS 131.02(3), (4), (8), (11), (14), (16), (27), (30), (32), (33), (43), (47) and (49), 131.03(6)(a)3., (b), Table 2, (c), (d)6., 7. and 9., (7), (9), (10)(b)1., (d)2., (11)(a) and (g) to (i), (13)(b) to (d), (15)(a)9. to 11., 18. and 27., 131.04(2)(a), 131.05(2), and 131.11(2)(a) and (b); to amend TRANS 131.01(2), 131.02(6), (6r), (10), (22), (25), (34), (35), (50m), (53) and (54), 131.03(title), (1)(a), (c), (d)(note), (2)(intro.) and (a), (b)(note), (3)(intro.), (d) and (h), (4), (6)(d)1., 3., 5., 8. and 10., (10)(a)2., (b)2., (11)(m) to (o), (12), (13)(a), (14), (15)(a)(intro.), (a)14. and 23., (b) and (c), 131.04(1)(intro.), (a), and (c)1. and 2, 131.05(3), 131.07(1)(intro.), (a) and (2), 131.09(3), 131.11(1)(a) (2)(a), (4) and (5)(f), and 131.16(2)(b), (c) and (3); to repeal and recreate TRANS 131.03(5) and (6)(d)2., and 131.12(2); and to create TRANS 131.02(1m) and (56m), and 131.04(2)(d), relating to vehicle emission inspection program.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that pursuant to ss. 110.06, 110.20(9), and 227.11, Stats., interpreting s. 110.20, Stats., the Department of Transportation will hold a public hearing on February A, 2008 at the Hill Farms State Transportation Building, Room 144-9, 4812 Shaboyoan Avenue, Madison JM, at 1:00 PM, to consider the agreement of the Trans 131. Misconsin Administrative Code, relating to the vehicle emission inspection program.

Parking for persons with disabilities and an accessible entrance are available.

A copy of the proposed rule may be obtained upon request from Steve Hirshfeld, Department of Transportation, Bureau of Vehicle Services, Room 253, P. O. Box 7909, Madison, WI 53707-7909. You may also contact Steve Hirshfeld by phone at (608) 266-2267 or via e-mail: stephen.hirshfeld@dot.state.wi.us.

additional inspection lane can be added at a later date if necessary.

5.4.10 Private Inspection Facility Requirements

5.4.10.1 General

Entransian in

In conjunction with centralized inspection facilities, the Contractor may establish a hybrid test network that includes private inspection facilities (PIFs). Private inspection facilities are facilities equipped by the Contractor with suitable test equipment, ancillary equipment, and VID connection to conduct tests on behalf of the WVIP.

PIFs may, but need not, be a set of franchises or otherwise related business enterprises. Grant the president that the president that the president that any analysis and have enclosed facilities for conducting this work. In either case, the owner(s) of these facilities would serve as subcontractor(s) to the Contractor.

Use of a PIF in lieu of a centralized test station for testing would be entirely at the motorist's discretion. Likewise, use of a PIF for both testing and emission-related repair, when needed, would be entirely at the motorist's discretion.

As part of each proposal including PIFs, Proposers must submit a plan for incorporating PIFs into the test network that includes:

- 1. Identity of establishments that would serve as PIFs;
- Scaled site and floor plans, and elevation views for each facility/site configuration to be used. (Plans may be undimensioned.) These plans should identify the location and configuration of entrances and exits, driveways, queue and parking areas;
- Descriptions and photos of facilities the Proposer proposes to use in the inspection network;
- A description of how inspection facility expansion requirements will be accommodated;
- 5. A narrative justification for the facilities selected;
- A maintenance program for supplied emissions inspection equipment;
- Detailed construction plans and blueprints are not required for proposal response.

5.4.10.2 Location

PIFs shall be located within two (2) miles of the Proposer's proposed locations. Ingress and egress from the site shall not impede traffic flow on adjacent streets or highways.

5.4.10.3 Facility Qualifications

To be eligible to serve as a PIF, a business must routinely conduct vehicular repair and/or diagnostic business and must be registered with and recognized